

STAT

There is no reason to think we are behind in the development of other things, too. It remains a fact that the Soviet Union was the first to explode the hydrogen bomb from a plane, whereas the United States, according to information on hand, exploded a hydrogen installation and is now preparing for new tests of nuclear weapons. I think that neither are we behind in the development of guided missiles.

STAT

Source:

USSR INternational Affairs

Moscow, TASS, [redacted]

Apr 24, 1956, 0210 GMT--L

(Text of speech made by N.S. Khrushchev at a luncheon given on the occasion of the opening of the British Industries Fair in Birmingham)

STAT

# KHRUSHCHEV SAYS SOVIET WILL MAKE H-BOMB MISSILE

Warns Britons Moscow Will  
Have Weapon That Can Fall  
Anywhere in the World

## TRADE CURBS ASSAILED

Restrictions Fail to Prevent  
Moscow Arms Advances,  
Party Leader Asserts

By DREW MIDDLETON

Special to The New York Times

BIRMINGHAM, England, April 23.—Nikita S. Khrushchev said today that the Soviet Union would make a guided missile with a hydrogen bomb warhead capable of hitting any target in the world.

This prediction was made in an extemporaneous speech by the leader of the Soviet Communist party at the British Industries Fair.

In two speeches tonight, Mr. Khrushchev described Social Democrats as enemies of the working class and refused to consider freezing 200 Social Democratic leaders imprisoned in Eastern Europe.

Turning to the disarmament talks now going on here, Mr. Khrushchev termed President Eisenhower's plan for aerial inspection a "fantasy." The Soviet Union, he said, did not want people going into their bedrooms or even their front gardens.

Until this afternoon Mr. Khrushchev in his speeches has stressed coexistence and respect for rival political systems. But a hostile reception accorded to him and Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin in Britain may have been a factor in changing his tune. He indicated that British trade restrictions on strategic materials also irked him.

Referring to stress now being laid on guided missiles, Mr. Khrushchev asserted "we can compete there, too."

### Restrictions Called No Hurdle

"I am quite sure that we will have a guided missile with a hydrogen bomb that can fall anywhere in the world," he said. "In spite of that, you do not want to trade with us."

[Other versions of the remark said Mr. Khrushchev had talked of manufacture of such a guided missile "quickly" and "very soon." However, the London bureau of The New York Times reported that those words had not been recorded by a journalist present at the luncheon who had taken down a direct translation of Mr. Khrushchev's remarks.]

Mr. Khrushchev asked whether the trade restrictions had "prevented us from doing anything."

"Do you think we are behind you?" he demanded. "It is a

Continued on Page 6, Column 2

## Khrushchev Says Soviet Spurs A Hydrogen Warhead Missile

Continued From Page 1

question of who is behind and who is in front."

Trade restrictions "do not prevent us in any way in making advances in our armaments," he asserted.

The Soviet Union, he said, was the first nation to explode a hydrogen bomb from an airplane.

"The Americans are only intending to do so because their previous explosion was not of a hydrogen bomb but of a hydrogen installation," Mr. Khrushchev said.

The Communist leader's evident conviction that his country has a lead over the United States casts new light on the Soviet protest last week against further nuclear tests by the United States in the Marshall Islands.

Before they left London Airport this morning, Mr. Khrushchev and Marshal Bulganin had been shown the Britannia, new British air liner, which can carry ninety passengers.

It is "a very fine plane," Mr. Khrushchev said. But the Soviet Union is building a transport plane for 170 passengers, he added.

The Communist leaders flew to Birmingham in a Viscount. Mr. Khrushchev described it as an "excellent plane." It carries up to fifty passengers and has four engines.

But, he asserted, A. N. Tupolev, Soviet aircraft designer, "has produced a jet airliner which takes forty-seven passengers and has a cruising speed of 850 kilometers [about 521 miles] an hour with two engines."

Repeatedly, Mr. Khrushchev emphasized the need for expansion of "real trade" as a step on the "road to friendship, real strong friendship" between Britain and the Soviet Union.

"The major factor in development of good relations is the development of trade," Mr. Khrushchev asserted.

But this trade, he indicated, must be more than the exchange of Russian crabs for British herrings.

He made it clear that he defined "real" trade as commerce in articles such as machine tools, which the West now bars to the Soviet bloc.

The Soviet Union has had to manufacture machine tools because it could not obtain them from Britain, the Communist leader said, "and having done so, we are no longer dependent on you for buying these tools."

### Definition Is Asked

Assailing restrictions on trade in strategic goods, the Communist leader asked for a definition of strategic and nonstrategic goods and assured the audience of business men "a really wide-scale development of trade is necessary so that you would buy what you need from us and we would buy from you what you can sell us."

A thread of dissatisfaction over their reception and of doubt over the ultimate success of their talks with Prime Minister Eden and Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd ran through Mr. Khrushchev's remarks.

The Russians' reception here

today, like that accorded to them in Oxford Saturday, must have given them some hints of British disapproval and hostility.

Refugees among the 3,000 persons near the Council House carried signs that demanded "freedom for Latvia" and "stop the terror in the Russian Ukraine." There also were Communists who cheered rhythmically.

When the motorcade drew up and the Soviet leaders left their car, there was a chorus of boos. The boos seemed even stronger after the Soviet leaders' reception by the Birmingham City Council.

### Visitors Noticing It

The visitors are beginning to notice it. Marshal Bulganin halted and put on his glasses to read the signs. Mr. Khrushchev in his speech later referred to "a few, very few, placards against us" and "a few cries" and one man who "even shook his fist at me."

Such incidents, Mr. Khrushchev said, could not disguise the fact that the Soviet Union exists as a great country.

Mr. Khrushchev used the incident of the man who had shaken his fist at him and drew a parallel between it and Allied intervention in Russia after the revolution in 1917 and Hitler, "who had to attack us with a clenched fist."

Referring to talks with Prime Minister Eden, Mr. Lloyd and R. H. Butler, Lord Privy Seal and leader of the House of Commons, Mr. Khrushchev said the atmosphere is one of "frankness, friendliness and mutual understanding, although we may be blunt every now and then."

He predicted the 10-day visit of the Soviet leaders would be useful and that the talks would be useful too. At this point he hinted the talks might not produce any important agreements.

The point, he said, is not whether the Soviet Union and Britain should reach "absolute agreement" on all issues but that a good foundation should be laid for development of friendly relations.

### Butler Optimistic

In London, Mr. Butler said: "If we can judge from the talks up to date and if deeds follow words, then we can say already that the visit has been well worth while."

The only British answer to the Communist leader's attack on restrictions on trade in strategic goods came from Peter Thorneycroft, president of Board of Trade, who was present at the British Industries Fair luncheon at which Mr. Khrushchev spoke. "The surest way to limit the number of strategic restrictions is to remove the fear," Mr. Thorneycroft said.

Marshal Bulganin, addressing the City Council, hailed Birmingham as a "hero city" of World War II and reflected philosophically upon misunderstandings between two countries after war.

"It is quite probable that both sides are to blame for part of that," he said.

The City Council, representatives of churches, except the Roman Catholic Church—which refused to send a representative—leaders of welfare organizations and business institutions heard Premier Bulganin assert that the "overwhelming majority" of British people and "the political leaders" want to cement and strengthen the friendly relations between the two nations.

From Birmingham the visitors flew to the Royal Air Force station at Marham. There they were shown Hunter fighters, Canberra medium bombers and Valiant long-range bombers.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 1956.

## Transcript of Dulles' News Conference on Concept for NATO

Special to The New York Times.  
WASHINGTON, April 24.—Following is a transcript of the record of the news conference held today by Secretary of State Dulles:

MR. DULLES.—Do you have any questions?

QUESTION.—Mr. Secretary, there has been a lot of interest and attention given to remarks in New York yesterday by the Soviet Ambassador to the United Nations. That interest has increased by several weeks. Are you inclined rather negatively about what the Ambassador said? Do you give us some of your further ideas on this subject?

ANSWER.—I do not feel that there is anything at this time in very much what I said yesterday. Broadly speaking, it is our view that an organization of this kind either grows or tends to shrink. And we believe that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization ought to be an organization which grows rather than shrinks up because they only were determined to expand in several purposes which may in due course be realized.

As I indicated yesterday, I believe that there is a basis for continuing vitality in the Atlantic Council, and that is the fact that which brought into being the Pan American Union, the American States, which have been over six years, and which have not tried to give our views or force our views, upon other nations. I guess, for a great many reasons.

Now, I do not think that there was an inconsistency in what I said yesterday with what I said in our earlier news conference. I did say that at that time there was a danger of it drying up.

A.—I don't think I said that there was a danger of it drying up. I think that certain types of it, if it related to economic transfers, members of NATO could perhaps be taken on through the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation), which includes in the main the members of NATO, and one or two other countries who are not members of NATO. But I do not think that I made a similar remark, which I still stand by, to indicate that there was no reason for it to grow and not to grow.

I don't want to discuss the details of the organization, one of fifteen members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This organization, I doubtlessly be discussed rather than not, I think that it is important to have a meeting in Paris and I think that we should have an exchange of views and the Council table with other partners and learn more of what is being done to refine and define our own.

Considering Two Aspects

Q.—Mr. Secretary, NATO is essentially a military organization. It would appear that political and economic possibilities are the only other areas. Are you thinking more broadly speaking, in the economic or the political line?

ANSWER.—Well, I would say we are thinking on both lines. This is the more proper way to handle the situation. And I think that we should have an exchange of views and the Council table with other partners and learn more of what is being done to refine and define our own.

Q.—You feel that OEEC is the more proper way to handle the situation in the economic matters as within Europe. But there are also conceivable relations to activities concerned with the activities of NATO countries, or some European and non-European countries.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, you told me that the United States Government plans to take the next NATO meeting to Paris, and that you are in agreement with the possibility of expansion or development of NATO or whether we should be more closely involved in the matter?

A.—Well, we will go with some thoughts. I think that yes, I may say that the general concept of my speech was directed to the United States Government's representatives at Paris, who made up the NATO Committee. Our views would be set out before I made my speech—but the situation indicates that there would be a greater receptivity to that point of view, I think.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, are you thinking of the kind of political development of the organization for example, which might make it possible, for instance, to consider such problems as Cyprus and other areas? Now, you're pinning me down a little more closely than I care for.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, when you said that you had in mind non-European countries, had you in mind undeveloped areas such as the Middle East, upon which NATO is dependent?

A.—I would think that both of those aspects of the matter should be considered. There is an agreement to deal with them or not. I wouldn't know.

There are also possibilities of joint efforts which might include the Soviet Union and other non-European countries, had you in mind undeveloped areas such as North Africa. That is, I think, the way it stands along that line. I don't want to imply that those problems should be considered. I merely mention them as indicating the possible range of thinking.

Stresses 'Distinctive' Patterns

Q.—Mr. Secretary, in general terms when you point out that the冷戰 which NATO may grow to be like, do you have in mind aspects of the Inter-American Peace Commission? That deals with regional disputes and the Economic and Social Council?

A.—Well, again I prefer not to go into that. I would say this, I do not say that there should be any exact correspondence between the冷戰 which NATO may grow to be like, and what you have in mind aspects of the Inter-American Peace Commission. That deals with regional disputes and the Economic and Social Council?

lasting Community might grow to be like. I would say the word "distinctive" for the very purpose of indicating that the冷戰 should not necessarily be exactly the same pattern.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, one of the characteristics of the Organization of the Americas in the Hemisphere has been within the limit of the area and its activities, and there has been any change in the basic character of NATO which would make it like that? The non-Communist countries in the Americas areas, as far as Switzerland and Sweden?

A.—Well, I do not contend that the Americas are not in NATO because NATO is a defensive military organization. The Americas are major and for some time probably will be a major phase of the cold war. And I think that the neutral status which those countries have elected to take, I could hope that they would actually join NATO.

Q.—How about Spain? Do you think that Spain would be a partner? A.—Well, as far as the United States is concerned, we would like to have Spain a member of NATO. And if the broadening of NATO activities were to continue, would, from our standpoint, one of the good by-products of that? But our basic difference of opinion within the Americas is that we have not tried to give our views or force our views, upon other nations. I guess, for a great many reasons.

Other Wants from the West

Q.—Mr. Secretary, can you tell us why there is a feeling among NATO countries that there is a danger of it drying up?

A.—I don't think I said that there was a danger of it drying up. I think that certain types of it, if it related to economic transfers, members of NATO could perhaps be taken on through the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation), which includes in the main the members of NATO, and one or two other countries who are not members of NATO. But I do not think that I made a similar remark, which I still stand by, to indicate that there was no reason for it to grow and not to grow.

I don't want to discuss the details of the organization, one of fifteen members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This organization, I doubtlessly be discussed rather than not, I think that it is important to have a meeting in Paris and I think that we should have an exchange of views and the Council table with other partners and learn more of what is being done to refine and define our own.

Considering Two Aspects

Q.—Mr. Secretary, NATO is essentially a military organization. It would appear that political and economic possibilities are the only other areas. Are you thinking more broadly speaking, in the economic or the political line?

ANSWER.—Well, I would say we are thinking on both lines. This is the more proper way to handle the situation. And I think that we should have an exchange of views and the Council table with other partners and learn more of what is being done to refine and define our own.

Q.—You feel that OEEC is the more proper way to handle the situation in the economic matters as within Europe. But there are also conceivable relations to activities concerned with the activities of NATO countries, or some European and non-European countries.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, you told me that the United States Government plans to take the next NATO meeting to Paris, and that you are in agreement with the possibility of expansion or development of NATO or whether we should be more closely involved in the matter?

A.—Well, we will go with some thoughts. I think that yes, I may say that the general concept of my speech was directed to the United States Government's representatives at Paris, who made up the NATO Committee. Our views would be set out before I made my speech—but the situation indicates that there would be a greater receptivity to that point of view, I think.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, are you thinking of the kind of political development of the organization for example, which might make it possible, for instance, to consider such problems as Cyprus and other areas? Now, you're pinning me down a little more closely than I care for.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, when you said that you had in mind non-European countries, had you in mind that you had in mind undeveloped areas such as the Middle East, upon which NATO is dependent?

A.—I would think that both of those aspects of the matter should be considered. There is an agreement to deal with them or not. I wouldn't know.

There are also possibilities of joint efforts which might include the Soviet Union and other non-European countries to assist in neighboring areas such as North Africa. That is, I think, the way it stands along that line. I don't want to imply that those problems should be considered. I merely mention them as indicating the possible range of thinking.

Stresses 'Distinctive' Patterns

Q.—Mr. Secretary, in general terms when you point out that the冷戰 which NATO may grow to be like, do you have in mind aspects of the Inter-American Peace Commission? That deals with regional disputes and the Economic and Social Council?

A.—Well, again I prefer not to go into that. I would say this, I do not say that there should be any exact correspondence between the冷戰 which NATO may grow to be like, and what you have in mind aspects of the Inter-American Peace Commission. That deals with regional disputes and the Economic and Social Council?

## Dulles Presses Change in NATO To Economic Collaboration Body

Continued From Page 1

be a step in the right direction. \* \* \*

Q.—Mr. Secretary, one of the characteristics of the Organization of the Americas in the Hemisphere has been within the limit of the area and its activities, and there has been any change in the basic character of NATO which would make it like that? The non-Communist countries in the Americas areas, as far as Switzerland and Sweden?

A.—Well, I do not contend that the Americas are not in NATO because NATO is a defensive military organization. The Americas are major and for some time probably will be a major phase of the cold war. And I think that the neutral status which those countries have elected to take, I could hope that they would actually join NATO.

Q.—How about Spain? Do you think that Spain would be a partner? A.—Well, as far as the United States is concerned, we would like to have Spain a member of NATO. And if the broadening of NATO activities were to continue, would, from our standpoint, one of the good by-products of that? But our basic difference of opinion within the Americas is that we have not tried to give our views or force our views, upon other nations. I guess, for a great many reasons.

Other Wants from the West

Q.—Mr. Secretary, can you tell us why there is a feeling among NATO countries that there is a danger of it drying up?

A.—I don't think I said that there was a danger of it drying up. I think that certain types of it, if it related to economic transfers, members of NATO could perhaps be taken on through the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation), which includes in the main the members of NATO, and one or two other countries who are not members of NATO. But I do not think that I made a similar remark, which I still stand by, to indicate that there was no reason for it to grow and not to grow.

I don't want to discuss the details of the organization, one of fifteen members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This organization, I doubtlessly be discussed rather than not, I think that it is important to have a meeting in Paris and I think that we should have an exchange of views and the Council table with other partners and learn more of what is being done to refine and define our own.

Considering Two Aspects

Q.—Mr. Secretary, NATO is essentially a military organization. It would appear that political and economic possibilities are the only other areas. Are you thinking more broadly speaking, in the economic or the political line?

ANSWER.—Well, I would say we are thinking on both lines. This is the more proper way to handle the situation. And I think that we should have an exchange of views and the Council table with other partners and learn more of what is being done to refine and define our own.

Q.—You feel that OEEC is the more proper way to handle the situation in the economic matters as within Europe. But there are also conceivable relations to activities concerned with the activities of NATO countries, or some European and non-European countries.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, you told me that the United States Government plans to take the next NATO meeting to Paris, and that you are in agreement with the possibility of expansion or development of NATO or whether we should be more closely involved in the matter?

A.—Well, we will go with some thoughts. I think that yes, I may say that the general concept of my speech was directed to the United States Government's representatives at Paris, who made up the NATO Committee. Our views would be set out before I made my speech—but the situation indicates that there would be a greater receptivity to that point of view, I think.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, are you thinking of the kind of political development of the organization for example, which might make it possible, for instance, to consider such problems as Cyprus and other areas? Now, you're pinning me down a little more closely than I care for.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, when you said that you had in mind non-European countries, had you in mind undeveloped areas such as the Middle East, upon which NATO is dependent?

A.—I would think that both of those aspects of the matter should be considered. There is an agreement to deal with them or not. I wouldn't know.

There are also possibilities of joint efforts which might include the Soviet Union and other non-European countries to assist in neighboring areas such as North Africa. That is, I think, the way it stands along that line. I don't want to imply that those problems should be considered. I merely mention them as indicating the possible range of thinking.

Stresses 'Distinctive' Patterns

Q.—Mr. Secretary, in general terms when you point out that the冷戰 which NATO may grow to be like, do you have in mind aspects of the Inter-American Peace Commission? That deals with regional disputes and the Economic and Social Council?

A.—Well, again I prefer not to go into that. I would say this, I do not say that there should be any exact correspondence between the冷戰 which NATO may grow to be like, and what you have in mind aspects of the Inter-American Peace Commission. That deals with regional disputes and the Economic and Social Council?

Continued From Page 1

that, while the North Atlantic Treaty Organization does not have any economic extent with economic transfers, it is clear that the economic problems can be dealt with in a more effective through (other) organizations. \* \* \*

Q.—Mr. Secretary, have you not made an investigation to find out what they are? A.—Well, that is what is going on. But that investigation is conducted by the State Department of Justice.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, in regard to the changes in Russia, is that the Russians are modifying the North Atlantic Treaty Organization? A.—That is not true. I would say that they are voluntarily modifying that.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to counsel the members of the Organization of the Americas to the United States foreign policy? \* \* \*

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

It falls within their jurisdiction, and I do not yet have any report. Of course, if the report is made public, it would make

Q.—Mr. Secretary, have you not made an investigation to find out what they are? A.—Well, that is what is going on. But that investigation is conducted by the State Department of Justice.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, in regard to the changes in Russia, is that the Russians are modifying the North Atlantic Treaty Organization? A.—That is not true. I would say that they are voluntarily modifying that.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

turn to a smaller weaker country, and say, "Well, we have this kind of relationship with the United States. Why don't you do the same?"

Now, it may very well be that the Soviet Union had projects to enhance that smaller and weaker country, and promoted if that country had the same kind of a relationship with us.

Therefore, we take into account of whether or not that would be tolerable as between two countries, but what use of Soviet satellites?"

Q.—Mr. Secretary, in regard to the changes in Russia, is that the Russians are modifying the North Atlantic Treaty Organization? A.—That is not true. I would say that they are voluntarily modifying that.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

turn to a smaller weaker country, and say, "Well, we have this kind of relationship with the United States. Why don't you do the same?"

Now, it may very well be that the Soviet Union had projects to enhance that smaller and weaker country, and promoted if that country had the same kind of a relationship with us.

Therefore, we take into account of whether or not that would be tolerable as between two countries, but what use of Soviet satellites?"

Q.—Mr. Secretary, in regard to the changes in Russia, is that the Russians are modifying the North Atlantic Treaty Organization? A.—That is not true. I would say that they are voluntarily modifying that.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is there a better forum to bring pressure on the Soviet Union to be more effective in dealing with economic problems outside Europe, to the question of a new role for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?